

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 29, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 5-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,864,394 (Jordan, III et al.), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Jordan, III et al. in view of an article authored by Abugov et al.

In response to the Office Action mailed May 29, 2007, Applicant amended claim 1 to specifically claim the step of defining an appropriate product/device input dataset for a plurality of different die sizes and products, wherein the dataset comprises information relating to the size of each die in two directions as well as the location of at least one of the corners of each die.

In the most recent Office Action (mailed July 7, 2008), the Examiner asserted that this is disclosed in Figure 7 of Jordan, III et al. Applicant respectfully traverses. Figure 7 of Jordan, III et al. merely illustrates a wafer, and the fact that it includes a repeating pattern (see col. 12, lines 37-43). Figure 7 of Jordan, III et al. discloses a plurality of dies on a wafer and that the dies have corners, etc., but does not disclose providing a dataset which comprises information relating to the size of each die in two directions as well as the location of at least one of the corners of each die.

Notwithstanding that Figure 7 of Jordan, III et al. does not disclose defining a dataset as is recited in claim 1, and despite the fact that Applicant believes that claim 1 and those claims which depend therefrom are allowable, claim 1 was been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from that which is disclosed in Jordan, III et al., to expedite prosecution. Now, claim 1 further recites: (a) defining an appropriate product/device input dataset for a

plurality of different die sizes and products, wherein the dataset comprises physical correlation reference points comprising information relating to the size of each die in two directions as well as the location of at least one of the corners of each die; and (b) collecting a die level yield bin dataset for one of the products/devices defined in step (a) by using the product/device input dataset to generate a table of data for the lots and wafers of said one of the products/devices with a virtual die coordinate for each die and a corresponding value.

Applicant respectfully submits that Jordan, III et al. fails to disclose defining a dataset as recited in claim 1 (i.e., one which comprises physical correlation reference points comprising information relating to the size of each die in two directions as well as the location of at least one of the corners of each die), let alone using the dataset as recited in claim 1 (i.e., to generate a table of data for the lots and wafers of said one of the products/devices with a virtual die coordinate for each die and a corresponding value).

Additionally, while claim 1 has been amended to distinguish even further away from, for example, Jordan, III et al., Applicant respectfully submits that Jordan, III et al. is very different from the present invention. Jordan, III et al. deals with scanning for anomalies. That is not what the present invention is directed to. In contrast, the present invention is directed to calculating high-resolution wafer parameter profiles.

In the Advisory Action mailed September 11, 2008, the Examiner asserts that “the ‘repeating pattern’ in fig. 7 reflects the fact that the dataset contains size and location information.” Applicant respectfully traverses. Figure 7 of Jordan, III et al. merely illustrates a wafer, and the fact that it includes a plurality of dies on a wafer and that the dies have corners, etc. However, no where is it disclosed or suggested to provide a dataset which comprises information relating to the size of each die in two directions as well as the location of at least one

of the corners of each die, and using this dataset to generate a table of data for the lots and wafers of said one of the products/devices with a virtual die coordinate for each die and a corresponding value.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the present claims not be deemed adequate to effectively define the patentable subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the claims in an effort to reach an agreement toward allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 7, 2008

By: 

James R. Foley, Reg. No. ~~39,979~~
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI,
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 704-1890

A58795.WPD